

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 27-37, 44-49, 51-61 are currently pending.
- Claims 44-49 and 51-61 are canceled herein.
- Claims 27-35 and 37 are amended herein.

Support for Amendments

Support for the amendments is found at least at Fig. 5 block 518, Fig. 6, Fig. 7 particularly at 712, and paragraphs [0090], [0134] to [0149], and other locations.

Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Roberts:** Roberts et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,289,812.
- **Thomas:** Thomas et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059621.
- **Bumgardner:** Bumgardner et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0206719.

Claims 27-37 and 44-46 Are Non-Obvious Over Roberts in view of Thomas

Claims 27-37 and 44-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Roberts in view of Thomas. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 44-46 are canceled herein, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Independent Claim 27

Applicant submits that the amendments to claim 27, presented herein, render the rejection of claim 27 moot. As amended, claim 27 recites, in part, “in response to the second multimedia presentation system receiving the bookmark, and without user interaction, presenting a second UI on the second multimedia presentation system, the second UI prompting for user-selection to resume the multimedia program at the second multimedia presentation system.”

Roberts is directed to, “techniques for using a location aware device to determine a current location, recording a location bookmark for the current location using the location aware device, storing the location bookmark, detecting at some later time that a location of the location aware device is within a specified proximity of the bookmark location and that a user-defined condition is satisfied by the bookmark content, and automatically notifying a user of the location aware device of the location bookmark.” (Roberts, Abstract.) Roberts is in no way related to bookmarking a location within a multimedia presentation such that the multimedia presentation can be resumed from that bookmarked location at a later time. Rather, Roberts is directed to recording global positioning system data in a portable device. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Roberts is not an applicable reference in this case, and does not provide any teaching that is relevant to the claims presented herein.

Thomas describes a system in which a user may, “freeze the delivery of on-demand media at a particular point,” and “resume the media at a later time from some other network location.” (Thomas, Abstract.) Regarding the resume functionality, in paragraph [0089], Thomas states, “FIG. 7B shows illustrative relocation display screen

750 that may be displayed when a command from remote control 300 of FIG. 3 is selected or when an appropriate option on an on-demand media display screen is selected to resume on-demand media that was frozen earlier by the user.”

While Thomas describes “freezing” on-demand media, and later resuming the “frozen” media at another location, Thomas provides no teaching or suggestion that the location at which the media content will be resumed is specified by the user at the time the bookmark is created. Claim 27 recites, “receiving, through the first UI, a user request to send a bookmark to a specified second locus from among the multiple loci, the second locus including a second multimedia presentation system, the bookmark including an indication of a point within a multimedia program.”

Because Thomas does not teach or suggest a user request to send a bookmark to another location, Thomas also does not teach or suggest presenting a UI at the specified resume location in response to receiving the bookmark. In fact, Thomas provides no teaching or suggestion that the bookmark is actually sent to the resume location. Thomas describes resuming frozen on-demand media in response to user input. Thomas does not teach or suggest, “in response to the second multimedia presentation system receiving the bookmark, and without user interaction, presenting a second UI on the second multimedia presentation system, the second UI prompting for user-selection to resume the multimedia program at the second multimedia presentation system,” as recited in claim 27, as amended herein. Rather, Thomas requires that the user, upon arriving at the resume location, access a server and request the media content that was previously frozen, which may also include a requirement that the user enter a password or other credentials.

Presenting a UI at the resume location that indicates that the bookmarked media content is available, *without requiring user input*, enables the user to more quickly resume the media content, without, for example, having to navigate onscreen menus to locate the bookmarked content. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Thomas and Roberts does not provide such a benefit.

Consequently, Roberts and Thomas fail to teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim, as amended. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 28-36

Claims 28-36 depend from independent claim 27. As discussed above, claim 27 is allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, claims 28-36 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 37

Claim 37 is amended herein to recite language similar to that discussed above with reference to claim 27. Specifically, claim 37 is amended to recite, in part, “a means for presenting a UI on the first multimedia presentation system, the UI including a display of the bookmark and a prompt for user input to accept the bookmark and resume presentation of the multimedia program at the first multimedia presentation system, the UI being presented in direct response to receiving the bookmark, the UI not being presented in response to user interaction with the first multimedia presentation system.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 37 is allowable over the combination of Roberts and Thomas for at least reasons similar to those given above regarding claim 27. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 47-49 and 52-56 Are Non-Obvious Over Roberts and Thomas in view of Bumgardner

Claims 47-49 and 52-56 are canceled herein, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **the Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative, to discuss the claims, amendments and the prior art, before issuing a subsequent**

Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Kayla D. Brant #46,576/

Dated: May 13, 2010

Kayla D. Brant
Registration No. 46576
509-944-4742
kayla@leehayes.com